

Pamphlets for the Proletarian. No. 10.

BP 161355

REPRESENTATION

AND

THE STATE.

BY

GUY A. ALDRED,

Minister of The Gospel of Revolt.
Late Prisoner for Sedition. . . .

WITH AN INTRODUCTORY ACCOUNT OF THE
AUTHOR'S TRIAL FOR SEDITION.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

LONDON :

Printed and Published by the BAKUNIN PRESS, W.
Obtainable *only* from the Author, 64, Minford Gardens,
Shepherd's Bush, W.

1910.

INTRODUCTORY ACCOUNT OF GUY ALDRED'S TRIAL for SEDITION

Ye see me in the cell, ye see me only in the grave ;
Ye see me only wandering lone beside the exile's weary wave ;
Ye fools ! Do I not also dwell where ye have sought to pierce in vain ?
Rests not a niche for me in every heart, in every brain ;
In every brow that brooding thinks, erect with manhood's honest pride ?
Does not each bosom shelter me that beats with honour's generous tide ?
Not every workshop brooding woe, not every heart that shelters grief ;
For am I not the breath of life that pants and struggles for relief ?

—FERDINAND FREILIGARTH, *The Angel of Revolution*.

Have you thought of the tedious days
And dreary nights of your imprisonment ?
The long endurance, whose monotony
No tidings come to cheer ? This were the trial !
It is the detail of blank intervals—
Of patient sufferance, where no action is,
That proves our nature. Have you this thought o'er ?

—J. W. MARSTON.

Guy Alfred Aldred, the author of the present pamphlet, was charged on a warrant before Mr. Curtis Bennett, at the Bow Street Police Court, on Thursday, August 26th, 1909, with writing, printing, and publishing "a certain scandalous and seditious libel" in the *Indian Sociologist* for August, 1909. The defendant conducted his own case throughout, whilst A. H. Bodkin appeared for the Treasury.

In opening the case for the prosecution, Bodkin stated that the prosecution was one that had been commenced by the Attorney-General for an offence of a public character and of a serious and important nature. It was committed deliberately by the defendant after warning, and not committed by him merely as a printer, but committed by him as a printer and as a writer of some of the seditious matter contained in the publication. The defendant was connected with the Bakunin Press. He held Anarchistic views, as appeared from the issue of August, 1909, in respect of which this prosecution had been undertaken, and he was a person who was known as the associate of Anarchists in London. The *Indian Sociologist* was a paper which appeared to have reached its fifth volume. It was described as an organ of freedom, and of political, social, and religious reform. It was edited by Krishnavarma from Paris, and was published for the express purpose of advocating what was called Indian Independence and in furtherance of the Indian Nationalist movement. It was patent, as far as the pages of the paper were relevant to the case, that there was preached, doubtless from the pen of Krishnavarma to a large extent, doctrines intended to bring about the absolute subversion of the Government of His Majesty in the Empire of India, and advocating and urging those upon whom appeals of that sort would be likely to have an effect to take all means to throw off what was called the alien yoke, means including open rising, violence, murder, and assassination. In May, June, and July, 1909, the paper was printed by Arthur Fletcher Horsley, of Manor Park, who was arrested, tried, and sentenced on

the very same day as Dhingra was sentenced. Prominence was given to the trial and to the remarks of the Lord Chief Justice in passing sentence, and thus any person who after that date did what Horsley had done had the most ample and open warning that this sort of printing and publication of seditious matter could not be regarded as otherwise than committing a very serious breach of law.

In July, a prominent Indian official was murdered in London by the man Dhingra, and it was borne in on the minds of all thinking people that the promulgation of seditious matter sometimes led to very terrible consequences. In spite of the awful occurrence in July, the prisoner, in the August number of this paper, put himself forward as the advocate of a Free Press. About August 20th, this issue came to the knowledge of the police, and copies were applied for and obtained. It bore the name and address of the prisoner as printer and publisher. As soon as its contents had been sensed by the authorities, they decided to act promptly. It was thought quite possible that, under the Newspaper Libel Act, this paper might fall within the definition of a newspaper, and on Wednesday, August 25th, Mr. Justice Hamilton, sitting in Chambers, granted leave to serve a summons on the defendant, calling upon him to show cause why he should not be prosecuted for libel as the editor and person responsible for what had appeared. The defendant appeared before the Judge in Chambers, and failed to show cause, Mr. Justice Hamilton making an order sanctioning the prosecution. A warrant was immediately applied for and executed, and at the defendant's premises 396 copies of the paper were seized.

The publication's contents on many pages were redolent of sedition. The accepted definition of sedition was the publication verbally, or in a document, of any matter intended to, or calculated to bring into hatred or contempt, or excite disaffection against the person of His Majesty, the Government, or the Constitution of the Kingdom, or the administration of justice, or to excite His Majesty's subjects to attempt, otherwise than by lawful means, to alter any matter that was by law established, or to raise discontent or disaffection among His Majesty's subjects, or to promote feelings of ill-will or hostility between different classes. There could be no doubt that a serious attempt had been made to raise discontent and disaffection among His Majesty's subjects.

Counsel then proceeded to call evidence of arrest. Chief Inspector McCarthy, of New Scotland Yard, then confirmed the statements of the Counsel bearing on what the prisoner had stated, &c., when arrested, adding that when asked where the *Indian Sociologist* was printed, the prisoner replied: "I must not give other people away," and refused to give any information on this score.

At this stage the case was remanded until Saturday, August 28th, when Chief Inspector McCarthy, of the special branch, New Scotland Yard, was recalled. He said it was part of his duty to keep observation on and attend meetings of Anarchists in London. He had known Aldred for about 2½ years and had seen him at such meetings and had heard him speak at them. Defendant held the views of a philosophical rather than violent anarchist, and his remarks were of a theoretical rather than violent kind. The witness had never heard him advocate violence. Defendant had never suggested that it was necessary for any individual members of the meetings he addressed to indulge in any form of assassination, but had said that it was necessary the people should be educated, and subsequently there would take place what the defendant termed "the social revolution." The defendant advocated what was called a general strike—anarchy through industrial conditions. Everybody would lay down their tasks and do nothing until the millenium arrives. So that by revolution, as expressed by the defendant, he had always understood some future occurrence which would take place after definite education, and not necessarily a violent uprising. When the witness arrested Aldred, the latter produced certain post cards and letters he had received from Shyamaji Krishnavarma dated from his address in Paris. In a

letter of July 30th, was the phrase :—" I approve of your idea of reprinting portion of the prosecuted numbers of my paper and the reprinted portions with any remarks you may make thereon may be circulated along with the *Indian Sociologist* without mention that it is a supplement."

A police-spy, named William Sauge, of the C.I.D. Special Branch, stated that he called at the accused's house on Saturday, August 21st, and failed to secure a copy of the *Indian Sociologist*. He represented himself as a private person interested in the movement. Acting under the instructions of Chief-Inspector McCarthy, he then wrote, on Sunday the 22nd, the following letter to the defendant at his Shepherd's Bush address :—" As I notice that you have taken charge of the publication of the *Indian Sociologist*, I should feel glad if you would kindly forward me four copies of the same, and oblige, yours faithfully, Thomas W. Hudson." He enclosed six penny stamps and received the four copies as requested. He did not think that, if it was true that the publication was of a seditious character, he was inciting the defendant to commit a deed against the law of the land by writing a letter in a false name after he had failed to secure a copy by falsely representing himself to be a friendly inquirer. He could not give any opinion as to whether it was a crime to incite a person to distribute a seditious paper, or what was called a seditious paper. He had not given a second thought to what it meant to incite a person to commit a crime.

The prisoner here scornfully indicated that his cross-examination of this witness was at an end by sharply turning to the magistrate with a sarcastic : "I think that will do, your worship."

Detective-Sergeant Brust stated that he wrote for a dozen copies of the *Indian Sociologist* for "himself and a few friends" on August 24th, and received them by post the following day.

Detective-Sergeant McLaughlin said that he had kept the defendant under observation for some months past. He had known him as an Anarchist. He had heard him address meetings dealing with general political affairs, but not on the subject of India. He had heard him treat of imperial affairs, however, although not of India directly. He had never heard him suggest political assassination or violence of any immediate kind at these meetings. So far as the witness had observed, the defendant had always acted straightly and uprightly and had not sought to evade observation.

This concluded the case for the prosecution.

Accused then made the following extempore

SPEECH FOR THE DEFENCE.

"In the first place, I wish to plead 'Not Guilty' to all counts in this indictment. In the second place, I desire, if I may, to point out, so far as the evidence already adduced is concerned, and also the opening remarks for the Treasury, that the prosecution is one of malice, conspiracy, and calculated misdirection; and I object to an immediate acquittal to the sessions on the ground that such committal would be one of indecent haste, likely to make for a non-securement of justice. So far as the question of malice and conspiracy is concerned, I will pass that, but for the moment, to return to it immediately. So far as the question of calculated misdirection is concerned, I will direct the Court's attention to what Mr. Bodkin, for the Treasury, described as the accepted definition of sedition. That definition reads as follows :—" Sedition is the publication verbally or in a document of any matter intended to, or calculated to bring into hatred or contempt or excite dissatisfaction against the person of His Majesty, the Government, or the Constitution of the Kingdom, or the administration of justice, or to excite His Majesty's subjects to attempt, otherwise than by lawful means, to alter any matter that was by law established, or to raise discontent among His Majesty's subjects, or to promote feelings of ill will or hostility among different classes." Like so many other definitions of sedition, or, for that matter, of any subject, which seem at first to be thorough and

correct, when submitted to a little analysis, this definition is seen to be particularly void of meaning, and to be one that is likely not only to lead to the apprehension of any person who is known as an anarchist, but for that matter also to any person who ventured to justify the decapitation of King Charles I. Were it to be defined as an offence against His Majesty's person only, it might lead to an entire abrogation of the present constitution, inasmuch as that constitution is the outcome of the middle-class uprising of Cromwell against absolute monarchism, which resulted in the setting up of the Revolution dynasty of William and Mary. In so far, therefore, as this definition described sedition as being an endeavour calculated to bring into contempt, &c., it may lead to political embarrassment and misapprehension on the part of the loyal and faithful subjects of the realm, since, should the King desire—which I don't *for a moment* suggest—to usurp the functions of the Commons, sedition would be the condition in which both the King's supporters and the supporters of the Commons would find themselves, according to the point of the view. For the rest, I do not think—

Mr. Curtis Bennett, the magistrate, who frequently interposed during the speech for the defence, now said: "You must try to put it rather short. This is really showing no defence. I cannot allow you to go on for ever in this strain. What is your defence to this charge?" The magistrate followed up this remark by moving from his seat to exchange some remarks with Mr. Bodkin. The defendant waited calmly throughout this interruption, and when the magistrate had resumed his seat, after laughing and chatting with Bodkin, he proceeded to resume the thread of his discourse as though no interruption had taken place:

"—that anything is likely to create such disaffection as the sense of the non-sacredness of one's private letters. Now, in this case, while it has been admitted by the police that my character is quite good, and that I am upright, the authorities have caused to be sent to me certain private letters which afterwards formed the basis of the prosecution. This, I suggest, is more likely to cause serious incitement to anti-constitutional methods by people who do not view things in the same philosophic way as myself than any activity of mine. Were the individuals who did this not agents for the police, and was their action aimed at the overthrow of some established authority, it would, legally as well as morally, be described as a conspiracy. The fact that I am only an ordinary subject of these realms should secure to me the same justice as if I was an established authority. If this be so, the fact that I am a victim of this conspiracy does not make the incitement—"

The magistrate again intervened by saying this was not to the point, the prisoner replying: "By thus dealing with this definition and the question of a conspiracy, I shall get directly to the point of the charge." This comment the magistrate overruled, by saying that the defendant was wilfully wandering from the point of the charge. The latter now somewhat tartly replied: "Well, if I am beating about the bush, you have only yourself to blame for allowing Mr. Bodkin to lose himself and the court in the woods. I am only following him." On the magistrate again interposing, the accused, amid some "hear, hears," from the well of the court, said: "Very well, I have secured my object. In that case, I reserve my defence." He was then committed for trial at the Central Criminal Court, bail being allowed in £100 himself and two sureties in £50 each, or one in £100.

The sureties were not forthcoming until Friday, September 3rd, when the defendant was released from Brixton Gaol, where he had spent the interval.

The case came on for trial at the Central Criminal Court on Friday, September 10th, before Mr. Justice Coleridge. Two days prior to this, in charging the Grand Jury to bring in a true bill against the accused, the Recorder of London, Sir Forrest Fulton, stated that both Krishnavarma and the defendant had been guilty of writing and publishing "a great deal of dangerous and pestilential matter."

When the trial came on before Mr. Justice Coleridge, the prosecution was represented by Sir William Robson (the Attorney-General), his Junior Counsel (A. H. Bodkin), and an array of other counsel. The accused here, as at the Bow Street Police Court, conducted his own defence.

In reporting the case at the time, the *Daily Express* stated that he was "boyish and defiant throughout," that he followed the case with keen interest, and "delivered a Hyde Park oration from the dock." The *Globe* stated that he was perfectly calm and self-possessed, but defiant. The entire capitalist Press commented on his youthful appearance.

In opening the case for the prosecution the Attorney-General was careful not to repeat his junior counsel's definition of sedition which formed so prominent a portion of the case for the prosecution before the Bow Street magistrate. This omission was quite noticeable. His speech otherwise proceeded along much the same lines as those along which Bodkin's police court effort had developed. He stated that the defendant wrote offering help and sympathy to a man who was avowedly defending murder of the worst kind, and who had brought down upon himself the reprobation of all decent persons in every civilized community. It might be said that Krishnavarma and the defendant—as the men who had advanced and expounded such a creed—were not only responsible for the death of the victim who happened to be slain by Dhingra, but also for the death of the murderer whose life was taken in obedience to the necessary law.

The Attorney-General then proceeded to cite quotations from the defendant's contributions to the columns of the *Indian Sociologist*. Defendant had contributed a column of *Passing Reflections* above the initials "G. A. A.," and seven columns of closely-printed matter, headed "Sedition," under his full name.* In the passages thus quoted, defendant declared the existence of the Government to be "a conspiracy against the liberty of the people," or, in other words, "a matter of high treason." He declared that "Prosecution for sedition was anti-constitutional"; stated that, "according to all the laws of jurisprudence, India, in its relations with England, was in a *state of nature*"; vowed "that the British Government glories in its association with the Czar, the cowardly murderer of many, whilst executing Dhingra, the political assassin of one"; eulogised Krishnavarma as being "a modern incarnation of the much-abused Marat," possessed, as such, of "the same political insight, same uncompromising proclivities and thoroughness"; but confessed that, in his opinion, the workers had nothing to gain as an International oppressed class from identifying themselves with the cause of Indian Nationalism. He remarked, however, that it was the duty of the English military rank-and-file to refuse to bear arms equally against the Indians, the Egyptians, and the class from which they (the military) were recruited at home. The defendant also wrote:—

"The question at issue is not the views of any particular person. It is the matter of the unlicensed liberty of speech and writing. If we would not be hanged separately by police repression we must hang together in opposition to political tyranny."

"Without the assistance of the British workers the tyrants who exploit them could not extend their dominions beyond the seas."

"Beccaria has denounced as barbarous the formal pageantry attendant on the public murder of individuals by Governments. He sees in these cruel formalities of justice a cloak to tyranny, a secret language, a solemn veil, intending to conceal the sword by which we are sacrificed to the insatiable idol of despotism. In the execution of Dhingra that cloak will

*The whole of these *Passing Reflections* and the article on *Sedition* will be reproduced, without any alteration whatever, in my pamphlet on *The White error in India and Egypt*. See advt. on another page.

be publicly worn, that secret language spoken, that solemn veil employed to conceal the sword of Imperialism by which we are sacrificed to the insatiable idol of modern despotism, whose ministers are Cromer, Curzon, Morley & Co. Murder—which they would represent to us as an horrible crime, when the murdered is a Governmental flunkey—we see practised by them without repugnance or remorse when the murdered is a working man, a Nationalist patriot, an Egyptian fellaheen, or a half-starved victim of a despotic society's blood-lust. It was so at Featherstone and Denshawai; it has often been so at Newgate; and it was so with Robert Emmett, the Paris communards, and the Chicago martyrs. Who is more reprehensible than the murderers of these martyrs? The police spies who threw the bomb at Chicago; the *ad hoc* tribunal which murdered innocent Egyptians at Denshawai; the Asquith who assumed full responsibility for the murder of workers at Featherstone; the assassins of Robert Emmett? Yet these murderers have not been executed! Why then should Dhingra be executed? Because he is not a time-serving executioner, but a Nationalist patriot who, though his ideals are not their ideals, is worthy of the admiration of those workers at home, who have as little to gain from the lick-splitting crew of Imperialistic, blood-sucking, capitalistic parasites at home as what the Nationalists have in India."

These passages, the Attorney-General urged, proved the serious nature of the seditious incitement of which the defendant had been guilty, especially when one remembered the excitable temperament of the Indian population to whom it was addressed.

The case for the prosecution was now brought to a conclusion by a repetition of the evidence that has already been recorded as having been given during the police court proceedings.

The defendant declined to call witnesses or to go into the witness-box himself. But he remarked that he wished to address a short

SPEECH TO THE JURY FOR THE DEFENCE.

This speech lasted fifty minutes, and included, of course, a good deal of matter of but transient value. Its most important passage was the following:—

"I have no apology to make either for my attitude towards Krishnavarma, or for what I have written with reference to the Indian question. I claim the absolute freedom of the Press, the absolute right to publish what I like, when I like, where I like. The only condition on which I can secure that right as a proletarian thinker is that I shall secure it for the Indian Nationalist Patriot, Krishnavarma. I can only do that by maintaining, at the price of my own liberty, the freedom of the Indian Nationalist Press, even where I may not agree with its principles. Krishnavarma has been denounced by the Attorney-General as 'a criminal resident in Paris. Apparently that gentleman means he does not stay in London to risk being transported to India. Sir William Robson knows that if Krishnavarma is a 'criminal' he can be extradited. Why is his extradition not applied for? Because he is not legally 'a criminal.' Because the Attorney-General is repeating in this prejudiced Court in safety that which he would not dare to express as an ordinary citizen in Paris. Gentlemen of the jury, I do not wish to be harsh with the prosecution, but, if you condemn Krishnavarma for not coming to London, you cannot acquit the Attorney-General for not going to Paris."

The Attorney-General now replied for the prosecution, after which the judge addressed his summing up to the jury, who returned a verdict of "Guilty" without retiring. The following colloquy now ensued between the judge and the defendant:—

Justice Coleridge: "Have you anything to say?"

Guy Aldred: "Nothing, my Lord, except that I desire no mitigation of sentence."

J. C. (mildly surprised): "Is that all? Have you nothing else to say?"

G. A.: "Nothing, except that I do not advocate political assassination."

J. C. (passing sentence): "Guy Alfred Aldred, you are young, vain, and foolish; you little know that others regard your statements far more seriously than they deserve. The sentence of this Court is twelve months' imprisonment in the First Division."

G. A. (smiling): "Thank you, my Lord!"

The defendant then left for the cells below, prior to departing for Brixton Prison, where he served the sentence. Before leaving for Brixton, however, he was allowed to see his friend, Rose Witcop.

The authorities at Brixton treated him with every consideration. He was released from gaol—having earned the full remission for good conduct—on Saturday, July 2nd, 1910. It may be mentioned that Mr. Justice Coleridge passed the highest possible sentence that the law permitted.



"The State! Whatever the State saith is a lie; whatever it hath is a theft: all is counterfeit in it, the gnawing, sanguinary, insatiate monster. It even bites with stolen teeth. Its very bowels are counterfeit."

—FRIEDRICH NIETSCHKE.

"Communism in material production; anarchy in the intellectual,—that is the type of a Socialist mode of production, as it will develop from the rule of the proletariat—in other words, from the Social Revolution, through the logic of economic facts, whatever might be the wishes, intentions, and theories of the proletariat."

—KARL KAUTSKY.

REPRESENTATION & THE STATE

I.

The argument that Socialism involves State tyranny of a type which the worker is not unacquainted with under present day society is one which the opponents of Socialism regard as being not the least valuable in their somewhat limited armoury. This fact, coupled with the somewhat hazy notions which even some Socialists seem to have as to the position of the State in future society, warrants an examination of the part the State plays in Capitalist society, an enquiry into its transient elements, and a recognition of what constitutes its permanent character. The matter is one which must be considered in the light of society's evolution. We must note how the Central Directing Authority in society has evolved its threefold function of legislative, judicial, and administrative power.

From living in a tribal state and gathering whatever nature offered him spontaneously, man slowly came to invent one weapon and tool after another, in order to aid him in his struggle for existence. Each instrument was more delicate and complex than its predecessor, and corresponded with the development of his skill as fisherman, hunter, and cattle raiser. The latter occupation carried with it a negation of primitive Communism, wherein no class struggle existed, and led to the private ownership of the land and instruments of labour which were the necessary basis of a final settling down to agriculture and handicraft. As pasture farming involved Communism, so cattle breeding on the one hand, carrying with it handicraft on the other, required individual skill, a negation of associated labour, and consequently private ownership of the means of production employed by the craftsman, and of the products which he created. Thus began petty industry based upon the individuality, the skill, industry, and perseverance of the worker, demanding, requiring, and securing unto himself private property. These were the basis of bourgeois society. From satisfying its own requirements only, the peasant family, owing to the progress of agriculture beyond the needs of the family, began to produce a surplus of food, tools, and garments. The situation of the family governing largely the nature of the surplus they produced and the differing implements required and tastes acquired, the basis for exchange was laid, specialization of industry was established, and goods were produced both for consumption within the establishment in which they were produced, and for the purpose of exchange for the products of another establishment.

Goods now became commodities, barter was established, and the necessity for some standard commodity or exchange value—such as gold—realised. Thus, as the handicraftsman had primarily produced for exchange purposes, so the peasant, in the course of industrial development, was brought to be a producer of commodities. The division of labour which these conditions necessitated took the form of every single concern producing a different class of goods, and the private ownership of the goods exchanged by those who exchanged them. Thus mutual independence in society, side by side with private property, became increasingly the main conditions of society. But now, as production for personal consumption was more and more superseded by production of commodities, buying and selling became an art, and merchant trading arose, the success of which was founded on buying cheaply and selling dearly. How these economic conditions made for monopoly, on the one hand, in the course of time, and for the creation of a proletariat on the other, is a subject which admits of too easy a development on the part of the reader, to justify me in lingering over details so obvious to all, and so ably presented in the writings of Marx, Engels, and Kautsky. The rapidity of industrial development in the terms of an ever-increasing velocity, and its financial reflex in the present generation of steam, electricity, and centralization, is apparent to the eyes of all. With the story of its daily unfoldment before him, let the reader but reflect how the peasant who produced goods for his own consumption gave place to the peasant who exchanged these commodities for other articles for his own use; how he, in turn, made way for the merchant who neither produced for his own use nor bought articles for his own use exclusively, but bought and exchanged commodities with the intention of making a profit. Thus, in the evolution of bourgeois society, we see how the removal from the manufacture and production of commodities constituted the road to wealth, how the merchant prince gave way to the financier, and the latter made for present day monopoly. The political reflex of this industrial development is found in the story of a social passage from Communism through tribalism to nationalism founded on feudalism and vassalage, to Imperialism and Colonial developments. And as the commercial class laid the basis of imperial development, so the financial class pursued the exploitation of other lands within that development, and identified successful share-mongering with national prosperity, and consol returns, and Imperial debts, with the opening out of Colonial civilization. The courage of the soldier, the nautical equipment of the sailor, the scholarship of the scientist, the permanent value of literature, were all subservient to Capital's idol—finance, its only standard of success.

But its anomalies were strange and disastrous. The little shareholder to live had to invest, and the success of his investment made only for his own buying out by the director king, who could then render his money useless as being no longer capital. On the

other hand, the investment failing, the shares could still be foisted upon the financial public, and the director retire the gainer. Thus, the standard of wealth, gold, concentrated into fewer and fewer hands, and with it the control of the means and instruments of production which nature had begotten and labour power created. Trade unions, to realise the value of their funds, had to invest in capitalist concerns, and found their officials, as a dependent official caste, opposed to strong industrial action against the capitalist class, because such activity would deplete—both by direct call and loss of interest on capital invested—the funds of the unions and hazard the jobs of the union officials. So that labour but became more enslaved as the development of capitalism found men drawn from the ranks of labour becoming, more and more, its interested officials, and legal administrators, in their official capacity as representatives of shareholding interests, preachers, legislators, and capitalistic philosophers.

In the face of these facts, coupled with the additional facts of the growing competition of women industrially, and the reduction of the standard age of the worker owing to specialization making more certainly for a negation of skilled labour—the advocate of woman's suffrage on the same basis as man's suffrage would hasten to secure the propertied enfranchisement of woman, whilst working men would witness the formation of Women's Trade Unions and Universal Adult Suffrage Societies; the Parliamentary Revisionist would seek to secure representation; the Proudhonist would blame monopoly and the State; and the proletarian would inquire what should constitute his attitude towards the State and its machinery. As a result of his enquiries the latter would point out to the first of these that he fully recognised that the fact of women having the vote would not render them more open to bribery than men, since that was an impossibility in view of the history of the pocket boroughs, the capitalistic proclivities of men, and the corruption of male Poor Law Guardians.

On the other hand, in view of the perpetuation of misery and exploitation in those countries where women have the vote, he would have to confess that the vote of women did not aid him in giving political expression to the class struggle so long as women voters failed to understand the economic conditions; whilst the enfranchisement of a number of women who belonged to the parasite class would seriously effect him in the securing of such a political expression of the industrial struggle. So far, therefore, as the woman's political enfranchisement was concerned, the proletarian could only note that, both as a question of abstract justice, and a matter of expressing politically the true industrial relations, absolute adult suffrage irrespective of sex and property qualifications was the only solution of the problem.

This would carry with it the right, so long denied, of women to be returned to Parliament. Whilst the basis of society's recog-

nition of this right, so far as working women are concerned, would be industrial fear, its realisation would have no different effect from the return to Parliament of working men—a fact that is demonstrated by the women trade union officials being neither worse nor better than the men trade union officials in the question of palliative effort rather than of Socialist endeavour. It would still leave, furthermore, the question of true representation untouched so long as the political machine was controlled in the interests of class society, and governed by the present system of representation on the lines of party voting.

This brings us directly to the question of what the State is and does, as a prelude to this difficulty of majority or minority rule—a difficulty which belongs purely to bourgeois society*. Of the intimate connection existent between economic and political freedom we have already spoken. Each fresh economic development carrying with it a corresponding political transformation, it follows that as absolute monarchy in the political world is mated with personal slavery and vassalage in economics, so representative government in politics goes along with the economic system of commercialism. In the course of this transformation, the social purpose of the State has been so evolving as to show the radical reconstruction which was—or is—in store for it in the future. As the aristocracy freed itself from the domination of the Monarchy, as the bourgeois secured their emancipation from their feudal oppressors, so the State has become less and less powerfully essential as an engine of oppression and more and more established as a vehicle of administration. Greater than all the decrees of despotism, Dame Nature's Constitutionalism has decided that the lot of the State for the domination of man by man must cease, and the *function* of the State as a machine for the management of production must be raised and developed.

As an instrument of domination it took its rise as a necessity at a certain stage of economic development, necessarily linked with the division of society into classes. It was the official representative of society as a whole, its personification in a visible body, but inasmuch as it was the State it only stood for the class which represented in itself the whole of society. According to the philosophic conception it was "the realization of the idea" of the kingdom of God upon earth, the domain where eternal truth and eternal justice realized themselves or ought to have done. The result was a superstitious reverence for the State and for everything in connection with it, which was all the more evident from the fact that his insignificance, the individual, was taught from childhood to suppose that public business and the common interest of society

*This question will be discussed at length in my pamphlet on *Trade Unionism and The Class Struggle*

could not be cared for in any other way than through the State and its well-paid employees.

It was fondly thought that a great step had been made in advance when faith was lost in an hereditary monarchy and claims laid to a democratic republic. But even the necessity for such claims was only to be found in the fact that the State's function was mainly legislative and judicial, not industrially administrative. An instrument of oppression used by one class over another, and quite as much so under a democratic republic as under a monarchy, its capture by the bourgeoisie, subsequent to the republican agitation, only meant that its existence was becoming less an absolute and more a representative one—and therefore more anonymous and changeable in character—its position was becoming more and more hazardous in view of the advancing industrial conditions in the direction of social production and distribution. Thus as economic conditions have made for Socialism, the political reflex has made less and less for the success of State tyranny. Let us analyze what the failure of the Capitalist State—as the last political reflex of class society—means.

Of late years, the cry for proportional representation, second ballot, etc., has grown in volume. The reason for it has been the obvious failure of the House of Commons, or Chamber of Deputies, as the case may be, throughout capitalist civilization to represent what is termed the opinion of the country. In other words, a majority on the Government benches of the People's Chamber may actually represent a minority of opinion in the country, and generally does not represent the true proportional majority in the country. The historic failure has long been pointing in this direction. On the other hand, the Capitalist State existing as a reflex of economic conditions, it can be seen that whilst the cost of its management is being paid for by the capitalist class out of the surplus value, the basis of its recognition of working class representation is the growing class consciousness of the latter class and the growth of revolutionary endeavour on its part. Even, therefore, as a palliative, and out of sheer despair of curtailing the growth of this spirit, the Capitalist State must give heed to the question of electoral reform, in its various phases of proportional representation, adult suffrage, &c., and even to the question of the abolition of the House of Lords.

Now, on all these questions, the division is rapidly becoming a class, and not an individual one. Bourgeois Radicalism, with its theoretical belief in the modification of the State structure in every particular, and antagonism to Imperial development, has found that the continuance of the society to whose support it looks, demands that their foreign policy shall be a continuation of Tory traditions, and their modifications of State structure exceedingly slow, timid, and expedient. Conversely, in matters of foreign policy and on questions of State structure, the Tory would adopt an attitude of absolute

autocracy and non-negation of the *status quo*. On either of these rocks, capitalism would be bound to split, Radicalism meaning the undoing of its political power to oppress, and Conservatism the centralization of the power to such an extent that its very menace would be its own undoing. Hence, whilst the political rewards and family traditions have formed the basis of individual adherence to this or that party, concessions to social expediency have been the basis of their political continuance and securement of the stability of the system. But this has meant the gradual but certain coming-together of the two parties for the defence of the profit-mongering system, the equally certain emphasising of their class-basis, the taking of common action against strikers at home and empire-disrupters in the colonies or abroad. The Liberal Statesman has vied with his Tory confère in oppression in Egypt, South Africa, and in India, as well as in shooting down the workers at home.

The growing evidence of the hypocrisy of this party system, its essential class unity, has been the cause of Labour, from relying on mere trade union activity, taking to political action. In *the whole* of that action compromise has been more apparent than stern defiance. But even so it has presented to the capitalist politician some evidences of the inherent tendency of class-society to undo itself.

To counteract such a possibility, all that capitalist politicians can do, with safety, is to concentrate their endeavours on the political reforms of adult suffrage, second ballot, and proportional representation as already indicated. Yet even so, to so extend the franchise and to secure a larger continuance of power, the task of the capitalist politician is no easy one, for to hunt the devil of corruption from parliament to people by an extension of the franchise, is only to more readily expose the basic rottenness of capitalist society and bring about the downfall of its empire.

More and more would it become apparent that the M.P.s were but the puppets of the Party-Whips and of the Cabinet, which were but the agents of the desires of trust-magnates, whose growing financial power would involve the corruption of business, politics, and citizenship; the easy punishment and bossing of Premiers, Senates, Titular Monarchs, and Republican Presidents; the ruin of the little middle-class whose affected contempt of the manual labourer would thus slowly vanish together with their position. Carrying with it, as can already be seen, the negation of legislative and judicial dignity, by rendering justice a farce and legislative chicanery, it would inevitably reveal the State's function as one coercive of persons and not administrative of things, and show that the instability of a corrupt society demanding the stability of a free society would not require the punishment of persons for evils which were socially produced and not individually malicious. It would

also show, that the punishment or coercion of persons was no guarantee of social calm.

Side by side with this would be the further fact—awaiting a social recognition—of the powerlessness of the State to do the one thing which would abolish, or at least check, all revolutionary endeavour—to abolish pauperism. Its only power, so far as it could concern itself with pauperism, would be seen to consist in police regulations, charity, &c. To abolish poverty it would have to abolish those conditions responsible for its own existence, and hence to abolish itself. As the abolition of ancient slavery involved the abolition of the Ancient State, so the abolition of modern capitalist slavery would involve the abolition of the bourgeois Representative State. As soon as it evolved to being the representative of the whole of society in a *complete* society, the judicial and legislative functions of the State would become superfluous, with the result that the State, as class society has historically known it, would become superfluous. Equally superfluous would become the anti-statism or voluntaristic production which partakes of the same representative character as the State, and is equally corrupt under class society. Growing out of the industrial conditions which necessitated the negation of private ownership, would be social ownership based on social production and distribution. Individually this would mean social freedom, whilst socially it would embody all the efficiency that a historically evolved administrative function, having its basis deep down in society's foundations, could alone carry with it. This, however, the opponents of Socialism tell us, would involve tyranny and expertism. Let us see.

Its erection being on a ruins of a society where production had been for profit and not for use, wherein the coercion of man had been at a premium against which the growing social consciousness had revolted, this would hardly appear to be the case. The failure of legislative and judicial activity being amongst its progenitors, Socialism could hardly perpetuate that coercion which its very coming into existence must necessarily negate. But now we have to consider the basis of expertism under capitalism in order to show it to be impossible under Socialism. Our preliminary shall be a statement of the attitude of the newly found individualist opponents of Socialism, who tell us that every State is a despotism, because, whether the despot be one or many, whether the State be monarchical or republican, solely from the principle that all *right* or *authority* belong to the collectivity of the *people*—and the collectivity represents the *status quo*, whether autocratic or democratic—its existence as a State implies the oppression of the individual, against whose interests the State arraigns itself. Agreeing that the historic rôle of the State has been that of a despotism, and that violence against State authority is no more criminal than legal violence against the individual, the proletarian must needs seek an explanation for the being of State

authority. "How is it that, whether by apathy or indifference, the *collective will of the people* supports the State against the individual well-being of the majority of the people? Why does the property owner pay taxes and duties to the State, and the oppressed worker seek its benediction?" asks this economical enquirer. "Education by the State," is the voluntarist reply. "But," pursues the investigator, "the State is but an anonymous reflex of the collective will of the people. If, therefore, the State create that will, it must be at least co-existent with it, if not, as the creative agency, prior to it. But it cannot be created by a will it creates, nor can it be a reflex of the collective will. If it is only a reflex of the collective will, how is that will formed? If the collective will is the outcome of statism, we must seek elsewhere for the latter's origin." Let us investigate.

Accepting the principles of the materialistic conception of history, we learn that, if the engineer is paid twenty times more than the navvy, it is because the cost necessary to produce an engineer is more considerable than that necessary to produce a navvy by nineteen times the cost of the latter's production. Now, it having cost society twenty times as much to produce the engineer than it did to produce the navvy, the engineer is twenty times more indebted to society than the navvy. Instead, therefore, of taxing society for greater privileges he should return more to society. As he does not, under the system under which the engineer flourishes because of advantages of education, the navvy is dispossessed of his rights; and therefore the capitalist system—which is at once society and the wage system—has established the technical education of the navvy's children in order to protect itself against the expertism of the engineer. In working its own undoing, once more, in a vain attempt to secure temporary relief, capitalist society is abolishing the expert in the interests of social progress. In the face of these facts to pretend that the expert will become a parasite and tyrant under Socialism is absurd. With his numbers growing his occupation is going, because—as an intellectual—he is rapidly becoming the rule and not the exception.

It may, however, be contended that, under capitalist society, it is the extent of monopoly in education and in industry, and not their various costs of production, which has enabled the engineer, the scientist, and the doctor, to draw from society ten or a hundred times more than the labourer, and the weaver to earn three times as much as the toiler in the fields, and ten times as much as the match-girl. Were this correct, it might, of course, justify the inference that under Socialism, the representatives of administration would so control industry and education as to become the monopolisers of its advantage, and hence impose upon the people a bureaucratic expertism. In order to expose the fallacious nature of this contention, it is only necessary to enquire more fully into what

is the industrial basis of that monopoly which enables the engineer, the scientist, and the doctor to simply draw their profits from their own sort of capital—their degrees and their certificates—just as the manufacturer draws a profit from a mill, or as a nobleman used to do from his birth and title.

The first in our enquiry will be to note that in modern capitalist society, as we have already shown, a bourgeois minority control and direct the means and production of social livelihood for the great majority—the vile mass of workers who toil to live and live to toil in the interests of the minority. Degraded, they receive the bare means of subsistence for preserving themselves and rearing other wage-slaves—their children—whose education also is in the hands of the capitalist class. Now, the sooner the children begin to work the greater is the commodity, labour-power, which is offered for sale; and the less the price required, owing to competition. The longer the child is kept from work—i.e., the longer the time spent in his education—the greater is his cost since his parents are receiving money from the capitalist class in excess of their immediate personal needs of subsistence. Consequently, having more time devoted to its education, it has to study and to live, be fed and clothed, for a longer period than children not so fortunately placed. It accordingly has to experience less competition at a later stage when offering its labour power to the capitalist class, and consequently demands a higher wage *necessary to the preservation of its position and knowledge*; and it is so placed because it has cost society more to develop its technical knowledge. If “monopoly in education and industry” be the cause of this discrepancy only, now, as the “nobleman’s birth and title” was formerly, how came the one cause to change into the other cause? The answer can only be, because of material development on the industrial plane; not the title, the educational privilege, nor the monopoly, but the industrial conditions necessitating these reflexes as sequences, the causes or cause. The privilege of a monopolised education, therefore, represents immunity from labouring at the expense of others who are rendered industrially immune from intellectual development. But here a strange factor enters in. As the feudalistic contempt for defending themselves, believing this to be the duty of bourgeois society, lay the basis of its downfall, so the bourgeois contempt for the studies as well as for the manual labour it gratefully abandons to the proletariat, is forming the basis of its own overthrow. Not only so; but its very evolution is a splendid object-lesson not merely in the tyranny but also in the ignorance of expertism. And so well has bourgeois society placed the hall-mark of its disciplinarian mediocrity upon all professions, that slowly but surely, genius is being forced to enlist in the class army of the proletariat.

Here, however, it is being taught to despise expertism as the

bourgeoisie—in its days of revolution—was taught to despise titles. That contempt has remained its consistent characteristic where its success has been most unquestioned. And it has paved the way for the similar contempt of proletarian genius for bourgeois profit-mongering to become the characteristic of future society. Thus, the evolution of the capitalistic educational system, has prepared a minimum educational basis for the future society to start from, which is founded on an ever-increasing negation of expertism; the development of its judicial and legislative machinery has shown not merely its class-basis but also the impracticability of judging and condemning men as criminals; the pursuit of its science has shown the basic psychological idealism of humanity, with its records of martyrs, and its social history showing that the greatest crimes of class-rule have been done in the name of lofty sentiment—in the name of justice, righteousness, and equality; and its giving birth to a class which is inspired by the lofty sentiment of freeing society from all class domination.

Thus, economically, politically, and psychologically the whole of the trend of social evolution shows that Socialism can only have its social expression in an era of freedom, and its political expression in a State which shall treat of the management of production instead of the control of persons*. The psychological guarantee against expertism will be found in the contempt with which all men will regard it, and the tendency to excellence of administration will be reposed in the admiration which all men will have for efficiency. Should this possibility still meet with opposition on the ground that such a central directing authority, finding its embodiment in a collective will, would not find legal oppression incongruous with its industrial basis, one can only conclude that either humanity is inherently bad and progress an impossibility, or else that in a system of absolute individualism must humanity's hope lie.

If in the latter alternative, then its basis must be that all social relationship is an impossibility since where co-operation takes place, management coming in, there must be some centralization of directive authority. But the whole trend of civilization serves to negate this assumption. Teacher and scholar, pulpit and pew, orator and audience, editor and readers, in their growing approximation to each other are emphasising the passing of capitalistic professionalism, and the development of Socialist simplicity. Even the military is being infected with the spirit of the revolutionary consciousness which is undermining the foundations of the Capitalist state. And amid the growing volume of its expression, is drowned the echoes of the sectarianism so common to class society. Men and women, seeking the spirit of the highest impulses, rather than the letter of

*Here the term "State" is used in a sense entirely unhistorical. Such a political order is Anarchy, and can only be termed "a state," in the sense of being a social condition.

the narrow dogmas of meaningless import, are seeing in its arrival the realisation of those impulses in the social Brahm, the communistic Nirvana. In this evidence of its philosophic harmony of movement may be caught a glimpse of the lofty impulses which have served to direct its evolution. It is this philosophic essence of unity which supplies us with a quintessencial index to the meaning of the evidence I have adduced in the present essay, showing the failure of the bourgeois representative system, the inevitable collapse of its state, and the erection on its ruins of a social system which shall in truth be apostrophised as the Commonwealth! For it would be the intelligence of the community that would select the most capable administrators of its workings, instead of the plutocratic administration deciding the limits of its representation.

II.

Happy augury of the liberty which will exist under the Socialist Commonwealth, we see that as the agencies of production and distribution have become increasingly social, despite the fact that control has been private, political freedom has become more and more a reality. Thus recognising the growing incongruity of its rôle of legal oppressor and its mischievousness to capitalistic production, the State has more and more concerned itself with the distribution of the armed forces, the duties of the secret police, the appointment of arbitration and conciliation boards, the feeding of necessitous children as a palliative. On the other hand, thus realising its administrative character on questions of penal reform and criminal punishment, its attitude has become "more humane"—as the bourgeoisie say—the decentralisation of its authority becoming synonymous with the growth of economic oppression, and the failure of the Party system. On all hands it is, therefore, being recognised that the social problem is rapidly resolving itself into an economic rather than narrowing itself down to a political issue. The duel is between the financier and the business man on the one side, representative of private profit; and the proletarian on the other, symbolical of production for use and not for profit. To these combatants, Liberal and Tory have given way; and significant of the change, their avowed capitalist successors, under the guise of individual freedom, have assumed a chastening attitude towards the State wherein their ideals have hitherto found a safe embodiment. Their fear is lest Socialism should involve majority tyranny. Their hope is that of impressing the workers with a consciousness of the essential liberty of capitalism. The better to remove their fear, let us outline and examine the basis of their hope.

The latter's foundations are laid deep down in the social life of the bourgeoisie. It had its corner stone in the right of individuals to privately own articles or instruments of production which constitute capital. Its edifice is to be found in a social structure which seeks the elevation of his insignificance, the individual, at the expense of his collective unconsciousness, society. Its science of being, subsists in the growing recognition by the bourgeoisie of

the necessity of mastering political economy, and the adaptation of its state-organisation to a harmonious incorporation of the rules evolved in the study. Its expression of its consciousness of its destiny is seen in the bourgeois appreciation of Buckle's very true declaration that the only good done by modern legislation was the repeal of the old. Prior to the bourgeois recognition of the importance of right opinions on political economy the State carefully sought to supervise in direct contravention of economic laws - the price of corn, the wages of labourers, the importation of corn, the manufacture of beer, the rate of interest on loans, attendance at divine service, the apprenticeship of children, the combination of workmen, &c. All this was done in the interest of a governing and established class, conscious of its security. But economic facts made for its undoing through the medium of the very laws thus passed in its own interests. A statute of Henry VIII. went so far as to forbid the use of machinery in the manufacture of broad-cloth, and the woollen trade threatened to take refuge in Holland, where the "divers devilish contrivances" were under no law. In order to encourage sheep-breeding, a law was passed that the dead should be buried in woollen garments, it being urged that since sheep would be bred, wool would rise in price, and mutton be cheaper. But economic laws re-established their inevitable social equation, and the artificial stimulant became an absurdity. All usury being urged as wrong on religious grounds, and it being thought that 10% represented the maximum interest which was compatible with a non-injury to trade, this was the interest fixed, in Henry VIII's reign, on loans. As economic laws asserted themselves, the anomalies this law created made for numerous modifications, until sound sense prevailed and any amount became allowable in the early half of the nineteenth century. Similarly, the State obtruded into the marital relations, and similarly its functions have become more and more anomalous, until now the right of Free Love, under the pressure of economical backing, is being recognised as valid by the bourgeoisie. Laws are to be found on the Statute Book setting forth with what amount of energy and thoroughness the ploughman shall plough each furrow. Regrating and forestalling were crimes, the laws against them being aptly said, by Adam Smith, to be laws against providence and thrift.

Recognising the general trend of economic law to assert itself, and realising the impossibility of averting the tendency, bourgeois society has made for the workman being, politically, a free man. It allows him the right to employ himself in any work he can get entrusted to him, so long as he recognises the right of the employer to employ whom he likes. He may demand any wages he thinks right, and take advantage of the favour of supply and demand in his direction, so long as he recognises the right of similar activities on the part of the employer. He may combine and boycott so long as he allows the right of his master to combine and boycott. Out

of this right of employer and employed the wage system itself springs as a form of mutual convenience, arising out of a co-operation in which, as Henry George might have it, one of the parties prefers a certain to a contingent result. Consequently, there is no "iron law of wages," but a natural and healthy reward, within capitalist society, for all human exertion employed in the production of wealth! So much for the capitalistic appearance of liberty for employer and employed!

Did matters thus stand still, and petty enterprise thrive in bourgeois society, this equal right of master and serf might thus form the basis of a certain amount of social sordidness, but never permit of matters coming to a head. But nature abhors such a contingency as certainly as she abhors a vacuum. And so it comes about that from time to time we hear of some Sugar King, or Railway Magnate, owner of some vast stretch of land, complaining at the uncontrollable character of the wealth and the industrial conditions which have made him. In America, the home of Trusts, no less so than in England where combinations are thinly disguised under various names, a few men control more money than does the Government. Their power being absolute, the bourgeoisie, mistaking itself for the whole of the people, plead that such individuals are corrupting business, politics, and citizenship, and in evidence of this assertion point to how titles are obtained in England, and how political power is controlled by millionaires in America. This plutocratic element, an increasing one under capitalism, judges men not by their principles but by their price. It regards public office as an article of merchandise, to be bought and sold the same as dry goods or railroad shares. The strongest political argument it can offer is a thumping cheque. It very being evidences the failure of democratic government, and shows that there is no difference beyond that of form between the crowned Monarch in England, the sceptred Emperor in Germany, and the uncrowned President of the United States. It means that even if in other details democratic representation was not a farce, the affirmative usages of government were controlled by plutocracy. To its offices were elected the sons of the plutocrats. Affirmatively, therefore, the State is but a bureaucratic institution, the official representatives of which tax or blackmail the capitalist class to the tune of several millions per annum for the privilege of being supplied with a standing army, navy, judicial bench, &c., for the purposes of enabling the capitalist class to pocket its surplus value—the unearned profit which it derives from the exploitation of the proletariat. A reflection of industrial conditions, the State is thus seen to be controlled by, and managed in the interests of, the capitalist class, whose turn the government must always serve, since government officialism is paid for directly by the capitalist class out of the surplus value. In other words, the cost of the army, navy, charitable institutions, police, bench, bar, and the whole judicial machinery, represents the

cost of the capitalists' class's insurance policy. Labour produces the wealth and capital pays the insurance. Official mismanagement is, in some directions, causing capital to resent the terms of its insurance and long for "Voluntarism"; in other directions, to long for better centralised control—and the rationalisation of the land, the mines, and the railways.

To the capitalistic advocates of the voluntaristic philosophy, who assure the world that one cannot get more intelligence out of the administrative or legislative machine than one puts in it, the proletarian—remembering that genius is also the mental characteristic of a revolutionary class during the period of outlawed existence—will lend a sympathy not unaccompanied with the reservation that, however true the statement, it does not concern the *proletaire*, in whose interests, Government, so long as the capitalist system lasts, will not, and cannot, be administered. When that system has departed, class interests will have vanished, and Government will be unnecessary. Antagonistic to the spirit and letter of government, the mastering of the industrial principle of the class war, will have supplied the proletarian with an explanation of its existence which will but serve to add a flippant contempt for government decrees to an intellectual scorn of its methods, and an intense hatred of conventional morality—so dear to drawing-room prudes living on the unearned increment which makes for prostitution—as being but the vicious profit-mongering pretences of an anonymous slave-society.



SPECIAL APPEAL.

TO MY COMRADES,

A heavy debt exists on my propaganda and cripples my endeavour. I am making arrangements to publish the *Pamphlets for the Proletarian* series as regular monthly efforts. To do this successfully, at least £50 is wanted immediately. All monies should be sent direct to GUY ALDRED, at 64, Minford Gardens, Shepherd's Bush, London, W., and will be duly acknowledged in subsequent issues. My comrades may rely upon my fidelity to the cause. I must rely on their assistance.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT!

SHORTLY TO BE PUBLISHED:

THE WHITE TERROR IN INDIA AND EGYPT.
THE WHITE TERROR IN INDIA AND EGYPT.

By GUY A. ALDRED,

Minister of the Gospel of Revolt; Late Prisoner for Sedition.

Pamphlets for the Proletarian

By GUY A. ALDRED.

From Anglican Boy Preacher to Anarchist Socialist Impossibleist.
80 Pages. With a Portrait of the Author. Price 4d.

The Possibility and Philosophy of Anarchist Communism.
12 Pages. Price 1d.

The Logic and Economics of the Class Struggle.
24 Pages. Price 1d.

Militarism and Revolution. 24 Pages. Price 1d.

Historical and Traditional Christianity. 48 Pages. Price 3d.

Religion & Economics of Sex Oppression. 48 Pages. Price 3d.

Basis & Exodus of Bourgeois Sectarianism. 56 Pages. Price 3d.

PAMPHLETS READY FOR THE PRESS. ONE PENNY EACH.

Trade Unionism and The Class War.

The English Battle for the Free Press.

Cromer's Anti-Socialism.

The White Terror in India and Egypt.

To be Published at Monthly Intervals.

NOTICE! Will all who have ordered pamphlets and, owing to my imprisonment, not received same, please correspond with GUY A. ALDRED, 64, Minford Gardens, Shepherd's Bush, London, W., when their orders will be immediately executed. The names and addresses of several correspondents have been destroyed, since it was deemed best not to allow them to fall into the hands of the authorities.

"THE LIBERATOR."

A Monthly International Journal devoted to the Extension of the Republic.

Edited and Published by EDWARD HOLTON JAMES,

22, Rue St. Dominique, Paris, France.

SUBSCRIPTION: One Year, 5 Francs or 4 Shillings, or 1 Dollar, Post Free.

The Communist Propaganda Group. A clear statement of the principles of this group is published as an appendix to GUY ALDRED's Pamphlet on Militarism and Revolution.